



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,431	07/31/2003	Hong Wang	42P15449	2852

59796 7590 07/25/2008  
INTEL CORPORATION  
c/o INTELLEVATE, LLC  
P.O. BOX 52050  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
----------

MOLL, JESSE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,431

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

JESSE R. MOLL

Art Unit

2181

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 have been examined.

Acknowledgment of papers filed: Amendment on 11 March 2008. The papers filed have been placed on record.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1- 3, 5-9, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 25- 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rotenberg et al. (Slipstream Execution Mode for CMP-Based Multiprocessors) herein referred to as Rotenberg, in view of Jamil (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0126365 A1).
4. Referring to claim 1, Rotenberg discloses an apparatus comprising: a first processor (Such as Processor 0, see Figure 2) to execute a main thread instruction stream (Task 0 (R)) that includes a delinquent instruction (any load which misses in the R-stream); a second processor (Such as Processor 1; see Figure 2) to execute a helper thread instruction stream (A-Stream) that includes a subset of the main thread

Art Unit: 2181

instruction stream (See section 3.2, second paragraph), wherein the subset includes the delinquent instruction (Any program will inherently include cache misses); wherein said first and second processors each include a private data cache (L1 data Cache, see section 2, first paragraph); a shared memory system (Unified L2 cache; see section 2, first paragraph) coupled to said first processor and to said second processor; and logic to retrieve, responsive to a miss of requested data (any data not in L1 cache) for the delinquent instruction (instruction referencing data not in cache) in the private cache of the second processor (lines which are not referenced at all by the A-Stream, see 2nd last paragraph of section 3.4), the requested data from the shared memory system (see see 2nd last paragraph of section 3.4); the logic further to provide requested data to the first processor (see the first paragraph of section 3 regarding preloading shared data into the L2 cache).

Rotenberg does not expressly disclose that the logic further to provide the requested data to the private data cache of the first processor.

Jamil teaches that the logic is further to provide the requested data to the private data cache of the first processor (paragraph 4, lines 18-21).

For this modification to be successful, instead of writing data to the shared cache to be read by another processor (Rotenberg; 2nd last paragraph of section 3.4), it would be written to the private cache of that processor (Jamil, paragraph 4, lines 18-21). In this instance, when the scout thread is prefetching data, it would prefetch the data by reading the data into its private cache to be used, and then transfer it to the private cache of the primary processor.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the invention of Rotenberg by making the logic further to provide the requested data to the private data cache of the first processor as taught by Jamil in order to decrease the access time of data required by the primary processor because communication with on-chip caches or caches of the same level, is faster than communicating through the use of an external shared cache (Jamil, paragraph 5).

5. Regarding claim 2, Rotenberg also discloses the first processor, second processor and logic are included within a chip package (see Figure 2 (c) ).

6. Regarding claim 3, Rotenberg also discloses the shared memory system includes a shared cache (see the second paragraph of the Abstract).

7. Regarding claim 5, Rotenberg also discloses the shared cache is included within a chip package (see the second paragraph of the Abstract).

8. Regarding claims 6, 20, and 27 Rotenberg does not expressly disclose that the logic is further to provide the requested data from the shared memory system to the private data cache of the second processor.

Jamil teaches logic providing requested data from the shared memory system to the private data cache of the second processor (see paragraph 23, lines 2-7)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the combined invention of Rotenberg/Jamil (see above regarding claim 1) by providing requested data from the shared memory system to the private data cache of the second processor as taught by Jamil in order to decrease access time for the second processor by pulling data into the private cache.

Regarding claim 7, Rotenberg also discloses said first and second processors are included in a plurality of  $n$  processors (See Figure 2 (c) ), each of said plurality of processors is coupled to the shared memory system (see the first paragraph of section 2); and each of said  $n$  plurality of processors includes a private data cache (L1 cache, see the first paragraph of section 2), wherein  $n > 2$  (see Figure 2).

Regarding claim 8, Rotenberg does not expressly disclose that the logic is further to provide the requested data from the shared memory system to each of the  $n$  private data caches.

Jamil teaches that the logic is further to provide the requested data from the shared memory system to each of the  $n$  private data caches (see paragraph 23, lines 2-7).

The combination would be successful if when there is a cache miss occurs in the second processor the requested data would be loaded into all private data caches. When the invention of Rotenberg fetches data into cache, the data is loaded into the shared cache, which is accessible by all processors. The combination would therefore

Art Unit: 2181

have to make the data accessible to all processors and must do that by transferring the data to each of the private data caches.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the combined invention of Rotenberg /Jamil (see above regarding claim 1) by making the logic provide the requested data from the shared memory system to each of the  $n$  private data caches as taught by Jamil in order to decrease access time for data needed by the processors (see above regarding claim 1)

9. Regarding claim 9, Rotenberg discloses the logic is further to provide the requested data from the shared memory system to a subset of the  $n$  private data caches, the subset including  $x$  (1; first processor; see above regarding claim 1) of the  $n$  (see Figure 2) private data caches, where  $0 < x < n$  ( $0 < 1 < 2$ ).

Note that if the logic provides the requested data to the private cache of the first processor, it would have provided the data to  $x$  (1) private data cache. Further note that the subset can include all processors because The American Heritage College Dictionary defines subset as "A set contained within a set". A set can be contained within itself.

10. Claim 11 recites equivalent limitations as set forth in claim in claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds as claim 1.

11. Regarding claim 12, Rotenberg also discloses a shared memory system coupled to said first processor and to said second processor (see the first paragraph of section 2); wherein said logic is further to retrieve the requested data from the shared memory

system if the requested data is not available in the other private data cache (see above regarding claim 6).

*Note that the limitation" wherein said logic is further... other private data cache" is equivalent to the limitation of claim 6 and is rejected on the same grounds.*

Regarding claim 13, Rotenberg does not expressly disclose that the logic is included within an interconnect, wherein the interconnect is to provide networking logic for communication among the first processor, the second processor, and the shared memory system.

Jamil teaches that the logic is included within an interconnect (refs. 151-156, 130, see fig. 1), wherein the interconnect is to provide networking logic for communication among the first processor, the second processor (see paragraph 23, lines 4-7), and the shared memory system (see paragraph 23, lines 6-7).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the invention of Rotenberg/Jamil by including logic within an interconnect, wherein the interconnect is to provide networking logic for communication among the first processor, the second processor, and the shared memory system in order to maintain cache coherency between caches without routing data off-chip when storing data in private caches (see Jamil, abstract). This increases memory throughput between processors (see Jamil, paragraph 5).

Art Unit: 2181

12. Claim 15 recites equivalent limitations as claim 3 and is rejected under the same grounds.

13. Claims 18 and 25 recite equivalent limitations as claims 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

14. Claims 19 and 26 recite limitations already discussed above regarding claim 1 and are rejected for the same reasons.

15. Claims 21 and 28 recite limitations already discussed above regarding claims 7 and 8 and are rejected for the same reasons.

16. Regarding claims 22 and 29, Rotenberg also disclose prefetching further comprises: retrieving the load data from a private cache of a helper core; and providing the load data to the private cache of the main core (see above regarding claim 8; if data is sent to all caches, it will be sent to the cache of the main core).

Claim 31 recites equivalent limitations as stated in claim 12 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds.

Art Unit: 2181

17. Claims 4, 16, and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rotenberg in view of Jamil and Jeddelloh (U.S. Patent No. US 6,789, 168 B2).

Regarding claims 4 and 16, Rotenberg /Jamil disclose the apparatus of claim 3 and claim 15.

Rotenberg /Jamil does not expressly disclose that the shared memory system includes a second shared cache.

Jeddelloh teaches that the shared memory system includes a second shared cache (col. 3, lines 66-67 & col. 4, lines 1-2).

The invention of Rotenberg would have been modified by adding L3 cache implemented in the chipset of the computer in addition to the L2 cache.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the combined invention of Rotenberg /Jamil because the use of L3 cache increases the overall size of the cache making memory accesses less frequent and therefore increasing overall system bandwidth.

18. Regarding claim 32, Rotenberg discloses a system comprising: a memory system (see first paragraph of Abstract); a first processor (Processor 0, see figure 2), coupled to the memory system, to execute a first instruction stream (R-Stream); a second processor (Processor 1, see figure 2), coupled to the memory system, to concurrently execute a second instruction stream (A-Stream, see above regarding claim 1).

Rotenberg does not expressly disclose helper threading logic to provide fill data prefetched by the second processor to the first processor.

Jamil teaches helper threading logic (fig. 1, refs. 151-156, 130) to provide fill data prefetched by the second processor to the first processor (Jamil paragraph 23, lines 4-5; see above regarding claim 1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the invention of Rotenberg by adding helper threading logic to provide fill data prefetched by the second processor to the first processor as taught by Jamil in order to decrease cache access time for the main processor (see above regarding claim 1).

Further, Rotenberg /Jamil does not expressly disclose that the memory system includes a dynamic random access memory.

Jeddeloh teaches a memory system that includes a dynamic random access memory (see paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combined invention of Rotenberg/Jamil by using a memory system that includes a dynamic random access memory as taught by Jeddeloh in order to decrease the physical size of the cache as compared to SRAM (see Jeddeloh col. 4, lines 52-54).

19. Regarding claim 33, Rotenberg also discloses the system of claim 32, wherein: the helper threading logic is further to push the fill data to the first processor before the

Art Unit: 2181

fill data is requested by an instruction of the first instruction stream (see above regarding claim 1).

Note that Rotenberg updates the shared memory (the memory being accessed by the main processor) as soon as the scout processor receives it. Using the cache setup of Jamil, the memory that would be updated would be the private data of the main processor which would be done at the time the data is reached in the scout thread ahead of the main thread.

20. Claim 34 recites an equivalent limitation as set forth in claim 22 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds.

21. Regarding claim 35, Rotenberg also discloses the helper threading logic is further to provide the fill data to the first processor from the memory system (see above regarding claim 1).

*Note that the fill data comes from the shared memory indirectly through the cache of the second processor.*

22. Claim 36 recites equivalent limitations discussed above regarding claim 13 and is rejected for the same reasons.

23. Claim 37 recites equivalent limitations discussed above regarding claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

24. Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rotenberg in view of Jamil and Luk (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0055964 A1).

25. Regarding claim 10, Rotenberg /Jamil do not expressly disclose that the first processor is further to trigger the second processor's execution of the helper thread instruction stream responsive to a trigger instruction in the main thread instruction stream.

Luk teaches the use of a trigger instruction to use in a main thread to start a helper thread (paragraph 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined invention of Rotenberg /Jamil by including an instruction in the main instruction stream to start execution for the helper thread as taught by Luk in order to use hardware to prefetch in situations where prefetching will help the current thread and being able to stop the pre-execution thread if it will not help and another thread needs to use the hardware.

26. Claim 17 recites equivalent limitations as stated in claim 10 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds.

27. Claims 14, 23, 24, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rotenberg in view of Jamil and Dhong (U.S. Patent No. 6,138, 208).

Regarding claim 14, Rotenberg /Jamil discloses the apparatus of claim 13, wherein: the first and second processor are each included in a plurality of n processors ( $n = 2$ ; only the first and second processors); and the interconnect is further to broadcast a request for the requested data to each of the n processors and to the shared memory system (Jamil, paragraph 24, lines 11-18).

Rotenberg /Jamil do not expressly disclose that the requests are done concurrently.

Dhong teaches a method for concurrently requesting data from two levels of cache (col. 4, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined invention of Rotenberg /Jamil (see above regarding claim 1) to concurrently request data in the private data caches of private processors (L1 cache) and the shared data cache (L2 cache) as taught by Dhong in order to decrease the access time for the higher level of cache by overlapping L1 and L2 cache accesses (Dhong, col. 4, lines 40-43).

28. Claim 23 recites equivalent limitations as stated in claim 14 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds.

29. Claim 24 recites equivalent limitations as stated in claim 12 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds.

Art Unit: 2181

30. Claim 30 recites equivalent limitations as set forth in claim 14 and is therefore rejected using the same grounds

### ***Response to Amendment***

The declaration filed on 10 October 2006 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Damron reference.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jesse R. Moll whose telephone number is (571)272-2703. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00 am - 6:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alford Kindred can be reached on (571)272-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2181

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jesse R Moll  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2181

JM 9/4/2007

/Tonia LM Dollinger/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2181